

From: Martin Edwards[/O=MMS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=MARTIN EDWARDS1F838E9D3-CC99-4040-B432-33552E99ED2DDD]
Sent: Fri 19/07/2013 9:40:58 AM (UTC)
To: Simon Baker [REDACTED] **GRO**
Cc: Alwen Lyons [REDACTED] **GRO** Susan Crichton [REDACTED] **GRO**
Lesley J Sewell [REDACTED] **GRO** Andy Holt [REDACTED] **GRO** Angela
Van-Den-Bogerd [REDACTED] **GRO** Mark R [REDACTED]
Davies [REDACTED] **GRO**
Subject: Re: briefing note for Paula / JA meeting

Thanks Simon, looks good.

I think it would be helpful to discuss the process for MPs' cases in further detail on the call, as this is still sounding a bit woolly and potentially unconvincing. Realise we need to retain a degree of case-by-case flexibility, but if we could come up with a unifying mechanism which provides reassurance on impartiality in all cases I think that would be helpful in getting this agreed upfront.

My only other question on the substance below is whether we want to commit now to putting new MPs' cases through the adjudicator. Do we need to do more work first on the gateway and terms of reference for the adjudicator? Again, let's pick up on the call.

Alwen (and Susan) - anything else to add to the brief? Would be good to have a few lines on handling upfront, i.e. what are JA and SS expecting from the meeting (how was it left last time), and what approach should Paula take? Is she initiating the conversation along the lines of the script below, or does she start with listening/ open questions etc?

Thanks,
Martin

Martin Edwards
Chief of Staff to the Chief Executive
Post Office

[REDACTED] **GRO**

On 17 Jul 2013, at 19:19, "Simon Baker" <[REDACTED] **GRO** [REDACTED]> wrote:

Martin, Alwen

I think you picked up the action to pull together the briefing note for the Paula / JA meeting.

My thoughts on content for the briefing:

Key Points:

1. Following the meeting on the 8th July Post Office has already implemented many changes and is serious about fully addressing all the issues raised in both the interim and final reports [some examples might be useful]
2. To ensure we make this investigation a triumph, we need to agree the best way of conducting the rest of investigation. There are two main objectives and we need to agree how best to deliver both

of them. The two main objectives are:

- a. "getting to the truth" on the key problem themes identified by JFSA and Second Sight
- b. Provide an independent review of the cases submitted by MPs

3. We propose that the Second Sight report, due in October, should focus on "getting to the truth" on the themes that Second Sight have heard from subpostmasters. Second Sight believe is the best use of their time. We have also discussed this with JFSA [Alwen I think you should include this in your conversation's with Alan]. This will also allow Post Office to get to the bottom of what we need to do to improve quickly.
4. We propose that we provide each MP an independent review of their case. This will need to be after the October report, as those findings will be an important factor in the MPs cases. The exact nature of each review will vary depending on the nature of the case (eg evidence availability, alignment to key themes, nature of the problem). In essence each review will be tailored to the requirements of the MP and their case. Second Sight will be involved in these. We propose that we meet with every MP during the summer and agree with them how we will best provide an independent review of their case.
5. Post Office is defining the independent adjudication process. This will provide sub postmasters the facility for an independent party to examine their cases going forward. We propose that those MP cases that were submitted after the cut off are submitted to the independent adjudicator.

Regards, Simon

Simon Baker Head of Business Change and Assurance

<image001.png>

2nd Floor, 148 Old Street, London, EC1V 9HQ

 GRO

postoffice.co.uk

[@postofficenews](https://twitter.com/postofficenews)

<image002.png>